

September 29, 2005

Tracie Billington  
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES  
P.O. Box 942836  
Sacramento, CA 94236

Subject: **Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management  
Proposal Evaluation for Planning Grant – Rancho California Water District**

Dear Ms. Billington:

The Rancho California Water District (RCWD) has reviewed the evaluation comments on the proposal submitted for an Integrated Regional Water Management Planning (IRWMP) Grant. Several review comments do not accurately assess the RCWD proposal. RCWD has prepared the following responses to your review comments:

**Work Plan – Score: 6**

1. *Comment: Alternatives for the IRWMP will be evaluated against objectives that are not discussed. The applicant states objectives will be developed, but this is not in the work plan.*

**Response:** As explained at the IRWMP Workshop on April 4, 2005, it was acceptable to identify preliminary objectives of the IRWMP if they had not yet been established. The proposal includes examples of primary objectives such as: reliably meet water demands, ensure water quality, ensure groundwater supply and quality, develop feasible water supply alternatives (potable and non-potable), develop and evaluate drought tolerance measures, protect natural environment, and ensure cost effectiveness. These objectives are listed in the Work Plan, on page 3, under the section titled "Objectives".

2. *Comment: There are no agreements in place with the agencies involved expressing interest and/or showing roles and responsibilities.*

**Response:** Letters of support from Eastern Municipal Water District, Western Municipal Water District, and Metropolitan Water District were obtained and submitted as attachments through the FFAST Website. Detailed agreements will be developed after completion of the IRWMP. Detailed agreements are not yet in place because projects have not been finalized, which is one of the goals of the IRWMP.

3. *Comment: In the budget, labor categories are not tied to hourly rates making it difficult to determine who is doing what and for how many hours.*

**Response:** The budget table (Table 1 of the Work Plan) is based on the example shown in Exhibit C of the Proposal Solicitation Package for Planning Grants. Table 2 provides the labor categories and the corresponding hourly rates. A breakdown of each task by labor category was not requested.

#### **Description of Region – Score: 2**

4. *Comment: The quantity and quality of regional water resources are not mentioned. This is a work plan item.*

**Response:** References to the quantity and characteristics of the region's water resources are provide on page 3 of the Work Plan under the heading, "Regional Agencies".

#### **Objectives – Score: 4**

5. *Comment: A partial list of primary objectives is listed. Once a complete list is developed, input from each agency will be used to determine priority. It is not clear who will be developing the complete list.*

**Response:** It is stated, on page 3 of the Work Plan, in the section titled "Objectives" that staff from each of the cooperating agencies (RCWD, EMWD, WMWD, & MWD) will further develop the list of objectives.

6. *Comment: The proposed IRWMP does not clearly include statewide priorities*

**Response:** It is stated that "goal of the IRWMP is to guide the development of alternatives to reduce reliance on imported water and provide recommendations for policy decisions to improve water reliability and drought tolerance." Each of these is a statewide priority.

#### **Impacts and Benefits – Score: 4**

7. *Comment: The proposal does not discuss including analysis of potential benefits with the exception of storage and use of recycled water.*

**Response:** The storage and conjunctive use project which the IRWMP would implement, groundwater management, conjunctive use, and surface storage. These are all benefits of the project in addition to recycled water use.

8. *Comment: There is no discussion of what impacts an IRWMP would have on the area.*

**Response:** The IRWMP would implement projects that include elements of water recycling, groundwater management, conjunctive use, desalination, water conservation and surface storage. Each of these elements of the project contribute to

the reduction of the area's reliance on imported water supplies as well as augment the area's own local water resources. The benefits of the IRWMP are described in the section of the Work Plan titled "Integration of Water Management Strategies".

**Data and Technical Analysis – Score: 2**

9. *Comment: The only discussion of data gathering is in relation to determining the water supply and demand.*

**Response:** The Work Plan also discusses the gathering of economic and demographic data, as well as treatment surcharges and billing data from MWD, RCWD, EMWD and WMWD. Potential data management solutions are suggested (GIS, database, etc.).

**Disadvantaged Communities – Score: 1**

10. *Comment: There is no discussion of DAC's.*


**Response:** No disadvantaged communities (DAC) fall within the boundaries of the region targeted for the IRWMP. Therefore, no discussions of DAC's were included in the Work Plan. It was explained at the IRWMP Workshop on April 4, 2005, that inclusion of DAC's was encouraged but that the absence of DAC's would not count against applicants.

We do not believe that the proposal submitted by Rancho California Water District was fairly evaluated and, therefore, did not receive scores appropriate for this regionally beneficial project. We respectfully request that the Department reconsider the scoring of the proposal in the following areas:

- Work Plan
- Description of Region
- Objectives
- Impacts and Benefits
- Data and Technical Analysis
- Disadvantaged Communities

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions please give me a call at (949) 587-1700 or Perry Louck, Director Planning with RCWD at (951) 296-6927.

Sincerely,  
**Water 3 Engineering, Inc.**

  
Scott Goldman  
Principal

Cc: Perry Louck, Rancho California Water District